



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

07/573,839 08/16/90

FREIBORG

F 226-8

NIXON & VANDERHYDE
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.
14 FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

MILLARD, W

136

4

09/17/91

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 08/15/91 This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1-31 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims 29-31 are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 1-28 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

A. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-28, in Paper No. 3 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (M.P.E.P. § 818.03(a)).

B. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the recitation "said slots" lacks antecedent basis.

C. Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph, as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Specifically, the process recitation "shrink-fit" fails to structurally further limit the previously recited apparatus.

D. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention

were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

E. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jameson et al. (U.S. 4,358,370).

Jameson et al. disclose a screen filter comprising a cylindrical screening medium and a backing plate with opposing and interfacing surfaces, as recited in instant claims 1 and 12. Jameson et al. also disclose a method of manufacturing a cylindrical screen comprising the steps of forming openings (elongated) and forming grooves (elongated), as recited in instant claim 20 (instant claim 23).

Jameson et al., in addition, discloses normal openings (instant claim 2), slots spanning two recesses (instant claim 3 and 14), a releasable connector (instant claim 4), ^{a connecting means (instant} claims 6-8, and 10, and 15), and a helixed groove (instant claim 21).

The material of manufacture and the article having the recesses (plate or screen) would depend ^{upon,} _{(1) on} the nature and characteristics of the medium being filtered (caustic or superheated mediums require more strength), and (2) the economics of which would be more feasible to modify.

F. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to W.L. Millard whose telephone number is (703) 308-0457.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist

Serial No. 573,839

-4-

Art Unit 136

whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

m
W.L. Millard/vd
September 05, 1991

Robert A. Dawson

ROBERT A. DAWSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 136